

CITY OF MUSKEGON  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES

January 16, 2003

P. Sartorius called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m., and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: M. Kleaveland, J. Aslakson, B. Mazade, P. Sartorius, B. Smith, J. Stewart, L. Spataro

MEMBERS ABSENT: S. Warmington, excused; P. Veltkamp, excused.

STAFF PRESENT: B. Moore, H. Griffith

OTHERS PRESENT: S. Czadzeck, Driesenga & Associates; J. Clark, 433 Octavius; G. Adams, 15 Ionia; G. Mudler, President & CEO of Hackley Hospital; Dr. Buchanan, ER Physician; R. Sampson, Flight Operator for Aeromed; J. Roberge, Director of Plant Services, Hackley Hospital; J. Strach, Director of Planning, Hackley Hospital; T. Metzdorf, Project Designer, BETA Design Group; C. Murphy, 1569 Clinton.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of December 12, 2002 was made by B. Mazade, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

There was a discussion whether or not to elect the officers in regards to the by-laws. J. Aslakson stated that since the terms for the commission members were changed and now expire at the end of January for each year instead of December, this should be postponed until the February meeting when the new commission members start. The commission members may want look at changing the by-laws regarding this.

A motion to table the election of officers until the February meeting was made by J. Aslakson, supported by L. Spataro and approved with J. Stewart voting nay.

B. Smith arrived at 4:06 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Hearing; Case 2003-1: Request for a Planned Unit Development on McLaren Street, Village at Jackson Hill, Finlay Development LLC. (staff put on hold-inadequate site plan). B. Moore presented the staff report. This piece of land is located in Jackson Hill and has frontage on both

sides of McLaren Street, northeast of Ryerson Creek. The parcel was recently rezoned from R-1 to RT to help facilitate a low-density, multi-family senior development, which was supported by the neighborhood. Staff was recently provided with floor plans and an elevation of the buildings. The elevation appears to meet aesthetic standards in that the garage doors are not more than 50% of the front face of the building. Additionally, the garage doors are set back from the front plane of the structure. Staff is concerned, however, that this design may be repeated 20 times in the same development for the 40 units. At a minimum, a few different vinyl siding colors should be provided. Another issue with the units is they do not comply with the minimum square footage standards of the ordinance. The ordinance requires 960 square feet for a one-bedroom unit and 1,060 square feet for a two-bedroom unit. In this development a one-bedroom unit would be 750 square feet (16 units total) and a two-bedroom unit would be 950 square feet (24 units total). Because this is a Planned Unit Development, there is some flexibility in permitting smaller units, which may make sense in this case because these units are intended for senior households which are smaller, have less space demand, and may not want larger units to maintain. As presented, the Fire Marshall has denied the site plan because the structures do not meet minimum fire access requirements. If the structures in question were sprinkled, however, that would negate the problem. Otherwise, the entire site may have to be reconfigured. The developer has agreed, per a phone conversation (12/10/03) that they would sprinkle the units that do not comply with access standards. Fire personnel recommend that all units be sprinkled because of the site topography. Essentially, the site is in a bowl, and it is difficult to access the rear of the buildings because of the slope and trees. The City Engineer also denied the site plan in that no information is provided with respect to the provision of utilities. If utilities are underground and in the roadway, this should not be a problem, they just need review and approval with the appropriate easements to the City Engineer. There is some concern, however, with water pressure in the area. The access drive on Alva is of concern. The drive should either align better with Sumner Ave. or be shifted north to prevent conflict between traffic taking the curve and traffic leaving the site. The internal access road should be named and built to public standards. There was no indication whether it is intended to be public or private. No sidewalks are proposed on site and should be provided on at least one side of the internal access road. There should be more clarification on the existing topography and trees vs. the proposed grading plan. The existing ridgeline and tree line should be presented along with the proposed changes. Additionally, the internal landscape plan is sketchy at best. Approve the plan with conditions. If for any reason the site plan changes significantly because of utility, fire access or other concerns, the plan should come back before the Planning Commission.

M. Kleaveland asked if the water pressure testing had not met the requirement. B. Moore stated that the Department of Public Works stated that the water pressure testing might not meet the requirement as the lines are older and may need to be fixed. The testing hasn't been performed yet. S. Czadzeck displayed a changed layout for the commission members. This re-aligned the interior street to be in line with Sumner Ave. He went over the staff recommendations. He stated that there might not be a problem with reconfiguring. There would be sprinkling to the units that may have a problem with fire access. A new plan would be brought back before the planning commission showing recommended changes. Fire hydrants would be shown on the water main plans, which they will work with Engineering on. The fire flow tests will be performed. They may have to extend the water lines from Jackson instead. The full utility plans would be submitted to the City Engineer for approval and they understand that this would

need to be by industry standards. The utilities shall be provided underground and easements shall be granted. The internal access road is not intended to be a public access road. They will talk to the City Engineer to make this possible. The access drive has already been shifted. Slope areas, trees, and landscaping go hand-in-hand and would go with the final grading plan. He is sure the developer would be willing to go along with breaking up the monotony of the building with the same exact design if this were required. B. Mazade asked if there would be a problem since the developer wanted to have less square footage for the apartments than required by the zoning ordinance. B. Moore stated that since this is for senior citizens, there is a rationale for relaxing the standard. P. Sartorius asked about the MSHDA (Michigan State Housing Development Authority) financing in regards to this. B. Mazade stated that once the developer pays back the MSHDA funding, the residency could change. B. Smith asked if they have the MSHDA funding already. S. Czadzeck stated that he didn't know, but his understanding is that they will have it. B. Moore stated that it is her understanding that MSHDA funding gives the developer permission to proceed. The developer then gets local approvals, then financing gets released. J. Aslakson asked if they could meet the Fire Marshal's recommendation to sprinkle all the units if it were required. S. Czadzeck stated that he didn't know that all the units would need to be sprinkled. His understanding was that those that didn't meet the fire access requirements would need to be sprinkled. B. Moore stated that the Fire Marshal was fine with the units being sprinkled that didn't meet the requirement, but would prefer that all the units be sprinkled because of the lay-out of the site. This would make the units safer. M. Kleaveland asked if the breaking up of the monotony of the units were subject to Planning Commissioner approval. B. Moore stated that it could be a condition of approval. Staff suggested changing the color of the siding for each unit but the developer may suggest something else that addresses the concern.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by M. Kleaveland, supported by J. Stewart and unanimously approved.

L. Spataro stated that he felt that the commission members were being asked to approve this prematurely. He would like to see everything worked out prior to the next meeting. He does see the internal street as being an extension of Sumner Ave. The buildings that were presented at the time of the zoning change, are not what is being presented now. He would like to see a plan that shows the concerns being taken care of. J. Aslakson agreed. He would like more information regarding the road. There was some questions regarding the sprinkling and he would like to see this cleared up. If he were to approve of this now, he would want all the units to be sprinkled, but if it isn't needed he doesn't want to create more expense to the developer. He would also like the opinion from the City Attorney as to whether or not they could add a requirement that this is for senior citizens only since there is a size difference for the units. M. Kleaveland stated that if the interior road were to be considered a public road, then it would need to meet the public roadway standards. He would also like to see something stating that this is for senior citizens only. B. Smith stated that she would also like to see the concerns addressed and be brought back. B. Moore asked the commission members if the reduction of the square footage for each unit would be okay with the members of the Commission. This would help the developer in addressing the other concerns knowing that is not an issue. P. Sartorius stated that he believed that the unit size is a good trade if done with some conditions. The commission members can't give an assurance based on the fact there would be new commission members for the next meeting. S. Czadzeck stated that the density of the units does

meet the RT zoning for the property. He does see a problem with making the internal street to city street size, as there is no outlet for the street. The PUD is a 2 meeting process. This meeting is a preliminary request. P. Sartorius stated that he wasn't sure that the commission members were ready to approve this first step at this time.

A motion that the planned unit development approval for 40-single-story senior living units for Finlay Properties be tabled until more information is obtained was made by J. Aslakson, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

## OLD BUSINESS

Hearing; Case 2002-58: Request for a Special Use Permit for a church at 1073 Evanston Ave., by Jim Clark. (tabled). B. Moore presented the staff report. The applicant has provided a proposed site plan, which reflects 15 parking spaces developed in the vacant lot adjacent to the proposed Church. Staff has not been provided with an occupancy number for the building to determine parking needs but the development of the parking lot helps. The Planning Commission needs to determine if using the school parking lot for the bulk of the Church's parking is acceptable. The property is located on Evanston Ave., adjacent to Oakview Elementary School, and was the former location of Meyer Music. The subject property includes the building and an adjacent vacant lot to the east. There are several other pre-existing commercial buildings also located on this block. The property is zoned R-1, Single-Family Residential. Churches are permitted uses in the R-1 district, under Special Use Permit. Since the principal building is already in place, staff was only able to review the site plan in terms of how the existing site would function in terms of the proposed use. Staff has reviewed the submitted site plan and has the following comments: a) The site contains one building and an adjacent vacant lot. The building was a former retail music store. b) The site plan shows the building coming up to the sidewalk in front, along Evanston Ave. In actuality, the building is placed at an angle from the street and sidewalk and there is a small amount of existing greenspace between the sidewalk and the building. The site plan needs to accurately depict the building placement and front setback on Evanston. The Zoning Ordinance requires that sufficient off-street parking be available for all uses, which for a church requires one space for each six seats or twelve feet of pews in the main unit of worship. Although the figure for total amount of seat or pew area is not given, the site plan does not appear to show sufficient off-street parking for this use. On-street parking may not be used to meet parking requirements, and staff has a concern with the impact of this use on the surrounding residential neighborhood if on-street parking is used on a regular basis. c) The applicant has stated that he is still discussing the possibility of sharing the Oakview Elementary School parking area with the school district. As this parking area is adjacent to the subject property, and could be permitted if an irrevocable shared parking agreement is provided. There is one large, mature tree on this lot, which needs to be preserved, and could count toward meeting landscaping requirements. d) The applicant must contact the Inspections Department prior to any activity on site to determine building code requirements for the proposed use at the subject property. Any alterations, remodeling or "change of use" will require sealed architectural blueprints be submitted that reflect the building will meet current code requirements before any permits or certificate of occupancy can be issued. No information has been given as to any proposed signage for the site. Given the size of the parcel, staff would recommend that the Planning Commission limit the signage to a wall sign. Staff recommends denial of the request, due to inadequate off-street

parking provided for this use, and insufficient (or incorrect) information provided on the site plan. The Planning Commission may wish to table the matter to allow opportunity to address parking and site issues.

J. Clark stated that they currently have about 30 people in the congregation, which would create 10 cars maximum at 1 time for the congregation. He needs to have the Fire Marshall view the structure and determine the occupancy for the building. This information would be needed in order to determine the parking that would be needed. Oakview School hasn't made their decision for shared parking yet. He is proposing to have 15 on site parking spaces and 1 handicapped parking space. There is also on street parking along Evanston. Currently their service is held at noon. Should the congregation grow, there may be a need to have 2 services. L. Spataro asked if Mr. Clark felt that Oakview School was going to enter into an agreement regarding the shared parking. J. Clark stated that he felt the school board would approve of this. L. Spataro stated that he would prefer to see the agreement prior to approving this request. J. Aslakson agreed. There are concerns that the congregation could grow and require more parking. He mentioned there had been an agreement between Nims School and the church that was across the street. He asked if the parking was the only problem. B. Moore stated that there was a need for more information regarding the landscaping, but other than that the parking was the main concern.

A motion that the special use permit and associated site plan for a church at 1073 Evanston Ave. by Jim Clark "The Church" be tabled until there is more information from the school regarding shared parking, was made by J. Aslakson, supported by L. Spataro and approved with B. Smith and M. Kleaveland voting nay.

A motion to hear Case 2002-57 before Case 2002-46, was made by B. Mazade, supported by L. Spataro and approved with J. Stewart voting nay.

Hearing; Case 2002-57: Request for a Special Use Permit to construct a new Emergency Center expansion at 1700 Clinton St., by Hackley Hospital. (tabled). B. Moore presented the staff report. Another site plan submittal was provided to staff and commission members with dimensions. The parking assessment report and inventory has not been provided to staff although a brief verbal report was given by hospital representatives at the last meeting. The commission members were provided with a letter that was forwarded to staff after the last meeting in their packets. The property is located on the southeast corner of Southern Ave. and Clinton St. Two other adjacent streets, Jiroch St. and Forest Ave., have previously been vacated. The property is zoned RM-1, Low Density Multiple-Family Residential. Medical office facilities are permitted under Special Use Permit in RM-1. The project involves an expansion of the emergency area and relocation of the helistop and includes removing parking areas and what was Jiroch Street. Staff is somewhat concerned about placing the helistop closer to the neighborhood rather than keeping it by Laketon where noise and propeller turbulence were more isolated from residences. Ambulance travel patterns will change as a result of the addition. Driveway access is not provided on Clinton, which should help keep traffic controlled to Forest. Southern would have two curb cuts closed with a new one constructed near Clinton. Snow storage will be a challenge on site. Planning staff has concerns about the number of parking spaces to be lost by adding a new building in what is currently an existing parking area. There are 94 spaces proposed in the site changes, but how many parking spaces currently exist

is not indicated. Staff is unsure of the total parking needs for the hospital campus, and what areas this particular parking lot currently serves although it appears to be well used, at least when staff has observed the area during regular business hours. A parking plan for the entire campus should be provided as part of this approval. Recall this was an observation on the other medical building proposed at the November Planning Commission meeting. Parking for the hospital continues to be a challenge and in the recent past several structures, many of them homes, have been relocated or demolished for surface parking. Consuming the neighborhood for additional parking is not healthy for the surrounding area. At some point in the growth of the hospital alternatives to surface parking should be explored, i.e. a parking deck or ramp. The landscaping plan meets ordinance criteria both in terms of saving sizable existing trees and providing adequate street trees and parking lot landscaping. Parking lot and helistop screening is being provided with landscaping. The Planning Commission could require additional measures around the helistop for more buffers to the neighborhood. All landscaped areas need to be irrigated. The north elevation facing southern has very few windows and a rather stark street presence. Helistop and other landscaping may break-up that view. The Fire Marshall's concerns with respect to fire access were addressed during initial discussions. His only comment was that during construction emergency access and hydrants must remain unobstructed. The City Engineer concurred with DPW on utility issues and approved stormwater management. There have already been several staff meetings with representatives of Hackley Hospital to discuss utility changes, emergency access, and staging of construction. The major items seem to have been resolved involving utility plans. DPW would like the following noted on the plans, however: a) 12-inch ductile (class 52) must be used with a minimum 5-½ foot cover (Forest St. profile). b) River crossing pipes need to be used where the sewer line goes under structure (Forest St. profile). c) Sewer manholes must be provided at every change of direction of public mains and at distances of not more than 400 feet. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions outlined below if the Commission is satisfied with the relocation of the helistop.

B. Moore provided the commission members with a copy of a letter from Aeromed. G. Adams stated that the helistop had not been moved. They had tried to come up with a different location, but none of the scenarios worked. They would still have the problem of having to transport a patient by vehicle to and from the helistop. They plan on having more landscaping for the area. They would have 2 helistops. The one that would be closest to the ER would be for critical patients only. The helistop near Laketon Ave. would be used for the patients that aren't critical. P. Sartorius asked if the dates on the Aeromed letter were accurate. The letter stated that the flights were from January 2001 thru December 2002. R. Sampson stated that the letter was based on the 2-year period. P. Sartorius read the letter from Aeromed into the record. Dr. Buchanan stated that having the helistop located by the ER would help save lives. Time is of the essence for a very critical patient. The current method takes 10 to 15 minutes. Currently the use of the helistop is 80% pediatrics. By having the helistop closer to the ER, would help reduce the likelihood of problems with critical patients due to the monitors and incubators that they might be hooked up to. The current process could cause the dislodging of the systems. The current system has a lot of movement for the patient. This could be cut in half if it were closer to the ER. The current method uses an ambulance for transportation. This causes an ambulance to be tied up when it could be used for another medical emergency. The current process could cause an ambulance to be tied up for up to 45 minutes or longer. There are also times when an ambulance isn't available for them to use for the transportation of a very critical

patient. J. Stewart asked if the death rate was up due to the current location of the helistop. Dr. Buchanan stated that the current location does raise the risk for death. M. Kleaveland asked if the staff is tied up longer with the current procedures. Dr. Buchanan stated that they probably weren't, although, the ambulance crew is tied up. P. Sartorius asked about the current procedures used when a patient is being transferred in regards to their equipment becoming dislodged and re-stabalization. Dr. Buchanan stated that there is more of a risk for the patient becoming unstable during the current process of moving them. The patient would have to be restabalized. L. Spataro asked if helicopters crash. Dr. Buchanan stated that they do. J. Stewart referred to a letter from Eric and Kimberly that had been submitted to the commission members. Some of the points of concern they have is there would be an increase in traffic and noise. They have a concern with the proposed curb cut location being so close to the Southern Ave. and Clinton St. intersection. The traffic along Clinton would increase. There is already a lot of noise from the power plant. There are plantings around the power plant, but it doesn't stop the noise.

J. Stewart stated that she is concerned with the helistop being so close to Southern Ave. and Clinton St. also. She understands the need to have the helistop close to the ER. She just doesn't feel this would be a good place for it. She brought up the requirements for parking. Clinton St. has parking on 1 side of the street. She added that Hackley Hospital had a plan to build a medical building over 1 of the parking lots used for the medical facilities at the back of the hospital, which had been tabled from a prior meeting. She felt that this could be inviting blight into an historic district if the helistop were so close to the neighborhood. A surgery suite could be built where the current helistop is located. B. Mazade asked if there were any concerns about the curb cut location being so close to the intersection of Southern Ave. and Clinton St. from the Engineering Department. B. Moore stated that Engineering hadn't made any comments regarding the curb cut. P. Sartorius asked about the distance between the curb cut and the corner. B. Moore stated that it looked to be about 30 ft. B. Mazade brought up the letter that the commission members were provided from G. Adams. They may want to further discuss placement of the helistop on top of the roof. Everyone needs to look at the needs of the hospital and of the surrounding residents. J. Aslakson stated that he understood the necessity for this request. It would be nice to have the ER located at Laketon Ave. instead. He lives 6 blocks away from the hospital and he can hear the helicopters. They are looking at about 1 1/2 flights per month. He suggested the use of another vehicle instead of an ambulance for the transportation vehicle. He isn't sure he could recommend approval of this request as it is an intrusion on the neighborhood.

L. Spataro stated that when he received the plans, there were concerns with the location. The area is congested. There is a need to protect the neighborhoods. There is already a lot of traffic in the area. This isn't a good location due to the foot and vehicle traffic for the area. He has concerns for the safety of the students walking in the area to and from school. The high school is located in this area also. Hackley Hospital is a valued member of the community. The needs of the hospital and the surrounding neighborhood would need to be met. There is the possibility of placing both the ER and the helistop together at the current helistop location. This would cost the hospital more money. This would also affect the property values of the surrounding area. Placement of the helistop on top of the building won't change the noise problem. He isn't comfortable with having this located in the neighborhood. M. Kleaveland stated that there isn't much of an intrusion with a helistop when there are only about 1-1/2 flights per month. If he

had a child that needed to be transported for medical attention, then he would want fast service. This makes sense and it works. L. Spataro had a different viewpoint. There is a noise nuisance to the neighborhood. M. Kleaveland asked if there might be a conflict of interest for some of the commission members who lived close to the hospital. B. Smith stated that she agrees that this is necessary. She believed that the concerns could be worked out with staff. J. Stewart stated that she didn't see how this would be a conflict of interest for the commission members. There are issues with decreased values and desirability of the homes in the neighborhood and this could filter into other neighborhoods. This would then affect the City's tax base.

P. Sartorius stated that since the public hearing for this case has already been closed; he would allow for a representative of the hospital and a representative of the neighborhood speak. G. Adams stated that they would agree with all the conditions proposed by staff. The parking study was completed and they will share this with staff. The curb cut had been reviewed by staff and there had been no concerns voiced at that time. They would be willing to move it should the commission members or staff wants them to. Regarding moving the ER, an analysis had been done and due to the age, etc. they would be better off moving the entire hospital to a different location. They had "beefed up" the landscaping. There would be security staff that would be sure that there is no one in the area when they know a helicopter is coming. P. Sartorius asked if there was an advantage to having the helistop by the ER. Dr. Buchanan stated that they are trying to get a level 3 Trauma designation. The helistop would have to be located by the ER in order to get this. They are working to improve the quality of patient care by doing this. P. Sartorius asked if they are experiencing the need for the treatment of trauma. Dr. Buchanan stated that they are. P. Sartorius asked if there was anyway to move the new proposed ER closer to the building. G. Adams stated that they could move it just a few feet, but it wouldn't make much of a difference. T. Metzdorf stated that they are also saving space for a MRI, which would have to be hooked up to the ER. J. Strach stated that they had looked to the future when deciding this expansion and the direct connection to the ER for any new technology that may come along years from now. There is always new technology coming out. They wanted to preserve enough clearance for this technology. There will be an area for the mobile disaster relief. This would have a decontamination unit (tent). She gave a definition of how this would be used. She stated that the building could be moved, but only slightly. T. Metzdorf stated that the building could probably be moved about 20 ft. G. Adams added that prior to acquiring the church property, they had checked with the City to make sure there is a possibility for the hospital to expand. T. Metzdorf stated that the helistop would need to be at least 40 ft. from the building. This limits the areas that the helistop could be moved to. L. Spataro had concerns that the helistop was too close to the potential pedestrians. He asked about the possibility of the new ER being contiguous with the existing building. T. Metzdorf stated that they had considered this. There are utilities that are under ground on the vacated Forest Ave. and they can't build on top of them. They also have to consider fire access to the other portions of the existing building. G. Adams stated that they had met with Engineering regarding the underground utilities. They were informed that it would cost a lot to move them so this didn't seem to be an option for them. J. Stewart asked where the parking would be. G. Adams showed the commission members on the map where the parking would be located. J. Stewart asked if they had any plans to expand into the neighborhood in the future. G. Adams stated that they had no plans to expand past Clinton or Southern. J. Stewart stated that at a meeting in the past and not regarding this request, this had been discussed and they were informed that it wouldn't go past Forest. G. Adams stated that it wasn't to go past Southern. P. Sartorius asked



if the helistop and parking lot could be “flipped”. This would be done by moving the helistop closer to the vacated Jiroch St. and moving the parking lot located at that location to where the current proposed helistop would be. T. Metzdorf stated that they would still want to keep the ambulance parking entrance separate from the public traffic.

C. Murphy stated that the residents are still concerned about the students. One security guard won’t be able to keep the students from walking across the helistop. She also felt that there would be more incoming critical patients being transported to Hackley Hospital if they do get the Trauma 3 designation. Dr. Buchanan stated that there wouldn’t be increased flights. B. Mazade asked if there would be fewer flights if they were to have a Trauma 3 designation. Dr. Buchanan stated that that would be a possibility. Most of the transporting is done due to pediatrics and he doesn’t see this changing. C. Murphy stated that the helistop could be moved to where the physicians are parking on Leahy. This would make the helistop only 1 block away from the neighborhood. J. Strach stated that this would still be further away and they would need to transport patients by ambulance. L. Spataro had agreed with the points that P. Sartorius had brought up with moving the helistop. They may want to still look at moving the underground utilities. This may be a better possibility. B. Mazade asked for the opinion of the hospital representatives. T. Metzdorf stated that the proposed building would be like a bridge. This way if something does go wrong with the underground utilities, they would be able to work on fixing them and the ER would still be able to function. There had been at least 3 meetings with the City regarding this proposal. It had been determined that it wouldn’t be practical to re-route the storm sewer. B. Mazade asked what the costs were. B. Moore stated that at the meetings, no dollar figure was provided. All that was said was that it would be a lot of money. B. Mazade suggested that if the moving of the utilities were possible, maybe Hackley Hospital and the City could come to an agreement. T. Metzdorf stated that they had never asked the City to pay for the moving of the utilities, they just wanted to know how much it would cost to see if it was feasible. P. Sartorius asked about moving the helistop. He showed them according to their map of the property what his “flipping” for the helistop and parking lot would entail. T. Metzdorf stated that this could probably be done as long as there is no problem with the flights. P. Sartorius asked how long it would take for the representatives to look at a different placement for the helistop and have a new plan ready. They would also like to see safety fencing along Southern Ave. so pedestrians don’t wander in the helistop. T. Metzdorf stated that it would be about a week. P. Sartorius asked the commission members would be available for a special meeting for Thursday, January 23 at 4 p.m. to discuss this further. The commission members agreed to the date. T. Metzdorf stated that they would have something ready for them at the meeting.

A motion that the special use permit and associated site plan for a new Emergency Center Expansion at 1700 Clinton St. by Hackley Hospital be tabled until the special Planning Commission meeting of January 23, 2003, was made by M. Kleaveland, supported by J. Stewart and unanimously approved.

Case 2002-46: Staff-initiated request for an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to create a new "Health Care" district for hospitals and related uses (tabled). B. Moore presented the staff report. To date, both hospitals have been asked to comment on the third draft. Staff has not received any comments. This may mean that there are no pressing concerns on their part with the language as proposed. The commission members were provided with the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft of the

proposed HC district regulations. The concerns that Mercy Hospital had raised were underlined in the draft (changes).

P. Sartorius asked about the screening for helipads. M. Kleaveland asked if Hackley Hospital's emergency room expansion and helistop would meet this requirement. He didn't want to create an automatic problem for Hackley Hospital's request. B. Moore stated that Jerry Adams, who is working with Hackley Hospital, wrote the original draft for the language.

B. Moore asked if they could add the actual sign size allowable of 32-sq. ft. for an entrance sign and 24-sq. ft. for a directional sign. P. Sartorius asked if the size for a sign was addressed in another area of the zoning ordinance. B. Moore stated that it is, but she would like to make it easier to look up the information by having it all together instead of having to look through the ordinance for the size. This is the same size that is allowed in a RM-1.

A motion that the Hospital District Language be recommended for approval to the City Commission, with an addition to the allowable size for signage to not exceed 32 sq. ft. for an entrance sign and 24 sq. ft. for a directional sign, was made by L. Spataro, supported by J. Aslakson and unanimously approved.

#### OTHER

2002/2003 Workplan – P. Sartorius stated that this could wait until the next meeting when the new commission members are present.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

hmg  
1/16/03